

# United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

---

## Finding of No Significant Impacts Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-9100-2011-0005-EA

---

February 2012

### February 2012 Oil and Gas Lease Sale

Location: Canyon Country District Office  
San Juan and Grand Counties, Utah

Applicant/Address: U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Utah State Office  
440 West 200 South, Suite 500  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0155

---

Utah State Office  
440 West 200 South, Suite 500  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0155  
Office (801) 539-4001  
FAX (801) 539-4237



**Finding of No Significant Impact  
Environmental Assessment  
DOI-BLM-UT-9100-2011-0005-EA**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis (EA) (DOI-BLM-UT-9100-2011-0005-EA) in order to address 13 lease parcels nominated within the Moab and Monticello Field Offices for the February 2012 Oil and Gas Lease Sale, consisting of 12,195.51 acres in San Juan and Grand counties. As provided for in the Notice of Competitive Lease Sale Oil and Gas, the proposal included all 13 parcels in the February 21, 2012 quarterly oil and gas lease auction.

This action provides for the orderly development of fluid mineral resources under BLM's jurisdiction in a manner consistent with multiple use management and environmental consideration for the resources that are present. Adequate provisions are included with the leases to protect public health and safety and assure full compliance with the objectives of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended and other federal environmental laws and regulations. Continued leasing is necessary to maintain options for exploration of oil and gas as companies seek new areas for production or attempt to locate and develop previously unidentified, inaccessible or uneconomical reserves. The sale of oil and gas leases will assist the growing energy needs of the United States public. The underlying need for the proposal has been met while accomplishing the following objectives:

1. Lease where in conformance with the BLM land use plans and consistent with state and local plans.
2. Protect important wildlife habitats.
3. Protect Traditional Cultural Properties and Indian sacred sites.
4. Mitigate impacts on other resource values, including air quality, fragile soils, water resources and visual resources.

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT DETERMINATION**

Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the project is not a major federal action and it will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined in 40 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 1508.27 and do not exceed those effects described in the Final Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) prepared for the Moab Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP) (2008, as maintained) or Monticello ROD/RMP (2008, as maintained). The February 2012 Lease Sale EA tiers to and incorporates by reference, the analysis contained in supporting documents as identified in the EA at section 1.6. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed.

This finding is based on the context and intensity of the proposal as described:

**Context:** The February 21, 2012 lease sale involved 12,195.51 acres of BLM administered lands within the Canyon Country District Office (CCDO) that by themselves do not have international, national, regional, or state-wide importance. BLM determined that the reasonable foreseeable development scenarios (RFDS) prepared during the planning process were accurate. BLM verified these projections again during the preparation of this EA.

Consistent with past drilling activity, it is estimated that exploratory wells would continue to be drilled in the CCDO at the rate of about one well per year for the foreseeable future. Drilling targets would continue to be primarily anticlinal structures within the CCDO.

The current rate of drilling, extent of disturbance and magnitude of impacts remain within the projection made in the planning process. The number of wells and the amount of surface disturbance that has occurred since completion of that analysis is less than predicted and remain within the range anticipated by the RMPs/RODs.

**Intensity:** The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27 and incorporated into resources and issues considered (includes supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1) and supplemental Instruction Memorandum, Acts, regulations and Executive Orders. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

**1. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse.** The proposed leasing would impact resources as described in the EA. Design features (stipulations/notices) to reduce impacts to other natural resources were incorporated in the leases and were based on decisions within the RODs/RMPs.

Collectively, these formed the resource protection measures identified in the EA. None of the environmental effects discussed in detail in the EA and associated appendices are considered significant, nor do the effects exceed those described in the existing NEPA documentation for leasing. Should all of the offered parcels be developed they may contribute substantially to local and regional energy supplies. Additional, site-specific NEPA analysis and further mitigation (as warranted) to reduce environmental impacts will be required at the Application for Permit to Drill (APD) stage.

**2. The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.** Leasing for oil and gas and subsequent exploration and development is an on-going activity on public lands. With the stipulations and lease notices attached to the leases and the additional NEPA analysis and potential protections applied at the APD stage, they will be developed in a way that protects public health and safety. For example, spill prevention plans will be required; drilling operations will be conducted under the safety requirements of Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Orders, and recommended practices of the American Petroleum Institute, including blow-out preventers, well bore casings and other industry safety requirements to protect workers and public health. Environmentally responsible oil and gas operations, including health and safety, are outlined within EA section 2.2 (Alternative A – Proposed Action). As such, all operations, including well pad and road construction, water handling, and plugging and

abandonment will be conducted following the “Gold Book” Surface Operating Standards for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development. As stated, the Gold Book provides operators with a combination of guidance and standards for ensuring compliance with agency policies and operating requirements, such as those found at 43 CFR 3000 and 36 CFR 228 Subpart E; Onshore Oil and Gas Orders (Onshore Orders); and Notices to Lessees. Included in the Gold Book are environmental best management practices; these measures are designed to provide for safe and efficient operations while minimizing undesirable impacts to the environment. For example, handling of produced water is addressed in Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7, which prescribes measures required for the protection of surface and ground water sources. During reclamation, if the fluids within the reserve pit have not evaporated within 90 days, the fluid would be pumped from the pit and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.

**3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to cultural resources and Traditional Cultural Properties, recreation, visual resources, vegetation, and wildlife.** Existing records regarding cultural resources indicate that the density of cultural resources is such that it is likely that a well pad could be located on each of the lease parcels without adverse effects on cultural resources. The Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has concurred with a determination of “No Historic Properties Affected” [36 CFR § 800.4(d)(1)] for this lease sale.

There are no other unique characteristics within or adjacent to the parcels.

The following resources and uses considered (including supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1) are not affected because they are not present in the project area:

Moab – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, BLM Natural Areas, BLM/State Sensitive Plant Species, Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Lands With Wilderness Characteristics, Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species, Wastes (hazardous or solid), Wild and Scenic Rivers and Wilderness/WSA.

Monticello – Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, BLM Natural Areas, Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness/WSA, Woodland/Forestry, Wild Horses and Burros and Areas with Wilderness Characteristics.

In addition, the following resources and uses considered (including supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1), although present, would not be affected by this proposed action for the reasons listed in Appendix C of the EA:

Moab – BLM/State Sensitive Fish and Wildlife Species, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Environmental Justice, Fish and Wildlife Excluding Special Status Species, Floodplains, Fuels/Fire Management, Geology/Mineral Resources/Energy Production, Groundwater, Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds, Lands/Access, Livestock Grazing, Paleontology, Rangeland Health Standards, Socio-Economics, Soils including Biological Soil Crusts, Surface Water, Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species, Wetlands/Riparian Zones, Woodland / Forestry and Vegetation Excluding Special Status Species, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness/WSA and Woodland/Forestry.

Monticello – Environmental Justice, Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species, Floodplains, Fuels/Fire Management, Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production, Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds, Lands/Access, Livestock Grazing, Paleontology, Rangeland Health Standards, Recreation, Socio-Economics, Soils, Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species and Sensitive Species, Wastes (hazardous or solid), Water Resources/Quality (drinking/surface/ground), Wetlands/Riparian Zones, Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species, Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species and Visual Resources

The Interdisciplinary Team Checklists (Appendix C of the EA) contain the specialists' determinations and rationale for those elements not present or impacted by the proposal. Issues including changes brought forward by public comment or internal review are discussed at EA sections 1.7, 1.8 and 5.3 and within Appendix D (Comment Response Table). Significance thresholds were not exceeded for any resource or use of the public land.

The stipulations and lease notices added to the lease parcels including standard lease terms under the Onshore Oil and Gas Lease Orders, those developed in the Moab and Monticello Field Office RODs/RMPs and those recommended in this EA, take into account the resource values and appropriate management constraints prescribed in the RODs/RMPs, as maintained.

**4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** Scientific controversy over the nature of the impacts does not exist. The oil and gas exploration and development that could follow leasing is a routine practice on public lands. The nature of the activities and the resultant impacts are well understood and have been adequately analyzed and disclosed to the public through existing BLM NEPA documents and within the EA.

**5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.** As stated above, leasing and subsequent exploration and development of oil and gas is not unique or unusual. The BLM has experience implementing the oil and gas program and the environmental effects to the human environment are fully analyzed in existing NEPA documents and within the EA. Therefore, there are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

**6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** Reasonably foreseeable actions connected to the decision to lease have been considered. As stated in the description of the proposed action within EA, a lessee's right to explore and drill for oil and gas, at some location on Standard Stipulation and Controlled Surface Stipulation leases, is implied by issuance of the lease. A lessee must submit an APD identifying the specific location and drilling plan to the BLM for approval and must possess a BLM-approved APD prior to drilling. An appropriate NEPA document is prepared prior to approval of the APD. Following BLM's approval of an APD, a lessee may produce oil and gas from a lease without additional approval. The impacts which may result from oil and gas development from leasing the parcels included in the selected alternative were considered by an interdisciplinary team within the context

of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and, as stated below, significant cumulative effects are not predicted.

**7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts – which include connected actions regardless of land ownership.** The interdisciplinary teams evaluated the possible actions in context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. A complete disclosure of the effects, including cumulative effects, of leasing the selected parcels is contained in Chapter 4 of the EA.

In summary, the EA establishes that increased surface disturbance relating to future potential operational authorizations relating to the Proposed Action alternative (leasing nominated parcels with recommended protective measures) may impact air quality, cultural resources, migratory birds, Native American religious concerns, recreation and visual resources.

It is anticipated that the additional resource protection measures associated with the Proposed Action would reduce the impacts to specific resources and areas within the cumulative impact analysis area (CIA). The minimal amount of disturbance associated with the expected level of development in the CIA, in combination with Gold Book standard operating practices, best management practices, and additional measures that would minimize development impacts, would result in a negligible cumulative impact on the resources within the CIA.

**8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.** Leasing of the parcels included in the selected alternative will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will it cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

As discussed in item 3 above, consultation with SHPO has been completed in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA and the SHPO has concurred with a “No Historic Properties Affected” determination. Given the requirements of the oil and gas lease orders, the governing land use plan and the other stipulations placed on the leases, scientific, cultural or historical resources would not be significantly affected. In addition, the following has been included as a formal stipulation [Washington Office (WO) Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2005-003] on all of the lease parcels subject to this sale:

*This lease may be found to contain historic properties and/or resources protected under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, E.O. 13007, or other statutes and executive orders. The BLM will not approve any ground disturbing activities that may affect any such properties or resources until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the NHPA and other authorities. The BLM may require modification to exploration or development proposals to protect such properties, or disapprove any activity that is likely to result in adverse effects that cannot be successfully avoided, minimized or mitigated.*

The Ute Mountain, Hopi, Navajo Nation, Paiute, Southern Ute, Ute Indian, White Mesa Ute, Pueblo of Jemez, Pueblo of Santa Clara, Pueblo of Laguna, Pueblo of Zia and Pueblo of Acoma Tribes were notified via certified letter. Based on the information received, the BLM has determined that the February 2012 Oil and Gas Lease offering has no potential to affect Tribes or Traditional Cultural Properties (EA at Appendix C).

**9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, or the degree to which the action may adversely affect: 1) a proposed to be listed endangered or threatened species or its habitat, or 2) a species on BLM's sensitive species list.** BLM initiated a programmatic Section 7 consultation with the USFWS for leasing dated December 13, 2004. On December 16, 2004 the USFWS returned with a memorandum concurring with the BLM's finding of "not likely to adversely to affect" for leasing. In that consultation, BLM committed to attaching to the appropriate lease notices that were designed to manage and protect specific listed species in conjunction with the authority of the ESA and the Standard Terms and Conditions of an oil and gas lease. BLM and USFWS have agreed upon the language of the lease notice which will notify lessees of specific species that require protection under the ESA. Additional consultation occurred for the California condor in June, 2008 and one for Canada lynx in April, 2007 since they were not undertaken as part of the consultation effort in 2004. As per the biological opinion prepared for each RMP (as maintained), the USFWS also concurred with the application of the respective stipulations applied for the protection of listed species.

In addition, the following has been included as a formal stipulation (WO IM 2002-174) on all of the lease parcels subject to this sale:

*The lease may now and hereafter contain plants, animals, and their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or other special status species. BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objectives to avoid BLM approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. BLM may require modification to or disapprove proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligation under requirements of the Endangered Species Act as amended, 16 U. S. C. § 1531 et seq. including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation.*

Since appropriate stipulations and lease notices for protection of plant and wildlife including special status species have been identified, as incorporated through interdisciplinary and interagency efforts, BLM has concluded that plant and animal species would not be adversely affected.

**10. Whether the action threatens a violation of a federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment, where non-federal requirements are consistent with federal requirements.** The sale of the parcels included in the February 21, 2012 lease sale does not violate any known federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. State, local, and tribal interests were given the opportunity to participate in the environmental assessment process.

In addition, based on the emissions estimates and consideration of the parcel locations relative to population centers and Class 1 areas, no significant air resource impacts including greenhouse gases are anticipated. Detailed analysis or modeling is not warranted [EA at sections 3.3.1, 4.2.1.1, 4.2.1.8, 4.3.1 (air quality)].

The project is consistent with the applicable resource management plans, policies, and programs as indicated in section 1.5, Conformance with BLM Land Use Plans, included in the EA. Additional consultation and coordination will be required during review and approval of site-specific proposals for oil and gas exploration, drilling and development.

/s/ Kent Hoffman  
Authorized Officer

3/14/2012  
Date